



Appeal Decision

by Helen Smith BA(Hons) BTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Welsh Ministers

Decision date: 05/06/2024

Appeal reference: CAS-02976-C6C4T0

Site address: Isfryn, Talsarn, Lampeter, SA48 8QE

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Stuart Roper against the decision of Ceredigion County Council.
 - The application Ref A220097, dated 6 February 2022, was refused by notice dated 13 March 2023.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a pair of semi-detached houses.
 - A site visit was made on 11 March 2024.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. In the interest of clarity, I have taken the description of development and the site address from the Decision Notice and the Appeal Form.
3. The planning application was originally submitted for 2 open market dwellings and was later amended to propose 2 affordable dwellings. I have determined the appeal on that basis.
4. Two Affordable Housing Statements were submitted with the planning application. However, only one related to the appeal proposal, to which I have had regard.
5. Since the submission of the appeal, Edition 12 of Planning Policy Wales (PPW) has been published. However, as it consolidates previously published content it does not raise any new matters that have any significant bearing on the decision.

Main Issue

6. This is whether the proposed development would be acceptable in principle having regard to planning policies relating to residential development in the countryside.

Reasons

7. The appeal site comprises of a parcel of land to the rear of a small group of dwellings within the hamlet of Llundain-Fach which is located some 1 mile to the east of the 'Linked

Settlement' of Talsarn, which has limited facilities, and within the settlement group of Felinfach/Ystrad Aeron as identified in the Ceredigion Local Development Plan (LDP). The appeal site is located in the open countryside within an area defined as an 'Other Location' for the purposes of Policy S04 of the LDP. The site is accessed from Talsarn via the B4342, a narrow unlit road with no footways. I saw that there was limited public transport provision within the vicinity of the appeal site.

8. Policy S04 of the LDP states, amongst other things, that 'Other Locations' are inappropriate for housing development unless justified on the basis that it meets a demonstrated unmet affordable housing need in the locality or a need for a rural enterprise dwelling in line with TAN 6. The policy also requires affordable housing to be located immediately adjacent to existing groups of dwellings, in line with the intentions of PPW. Whilst PPW has since been updated, these local policy provisions are consistent with the current objectives of national policy to strictly control new development away from existing settlements, and to locate development within and adjoining those settlements where it can best be accommodated in terms of, amongst other things, infrastructure and access.
9. In identifying the site as being in an 'Other Location', the LDP recognises that this location is less sustainable than those within an Urban or Rural Service Centre. Although the site is adjacent to a small group of dwellings, it is not located within or adjacent to a defined settlement and I saw that there are few services within reasonable walking or cycling distance. For this reason, and having regard to the highway conditions and limited public transport in the vicinity, future occupiers would likely be reliant on the car to access essential facilities. The proposal would therefore not occupy a sustainable location.
10. I have considered the evidence submitted by the appellant which contends that the proposal would meet an identified local need for affordable dwellings. However, neither this nor the size of the dwellings alters my findings that the siting of the proposal would be harmful to the achievement of sustainable development patterns, in conflict with the objectives of PPW and LDP policy S04.
11. The appellant states that the dwellings would be occupied by family of the owner of land, farms and a well-established agriculture business in the locality. Although I recognise the desire to provide younger family members the opportunity to work in the family business, no evidence is before me to suggest the dwellings would comprise rural enterprise dwellings as defined in Technical Advice Note 6 'Planning for Sustainable Rural Communities' (TAN 6). Consequently, there is no justified need on this basis.
12. The appellant has drawn my attention to a new build property near the site which was granted planning permission (application ref: A100128). However, the full circumstances of this development are not before me, so I am unable to consider whether the circumstances of that permission were directly comparable to the appeal proposal. I have therefore considered the appeal on its own merits.
13. For the reasons set out above, I conclude that the proposed development would result in unjustified and unsustainable residential development in the countryside, contrary to policy S04 of the LDP and the objectives of PPW.

Conclusion

14. For the reasons set out above, and having regard to all matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.
15. In reaching my decision, I have taken into account the requirements of sections 3 and 5 of the Well-Being of Future Generations (Wales) Act 2015. I consider that this decision is

Ref: CAS-02976-C6C4T0

in accordance with the Act's sustainable development principle through its contribution towards one or more of the Welsh Ministers' well-being objectives.

H Smith

INSPECTOR